arXiv:1704.06977v1 [stat.ME] 23 Apr 2017

# Overlapping Variable Clustering with Statistical Guarantees

Florentina Bunea* Yang Ning† Marten Wegkamp‡

**Abstract**

Variable clustering is one of the most important unsupervised learning methods, ubiquitous in most research areas. In the statistics and computer science literature, most of the clustering methods lead to non-overlapping partitions of the variables. However, in many applications, some variables may belong to multiple groups, yielding clusters with overlap. It is still largely unknown how to perform overlapping variable clustering with statistical guarantees. To bridge this gap, we propose a novel **L**atent model-based **OVE**rlapping clustering method (LOVE) to recover overlapping sub-groups of a potentially very large group of variables. In our model-based formulation, a cluster is given by variables associated with the same latent factor, and can be determined from an allocation matrix $A$ that indexes our proposed latent model. We assume that some of the observed variables are *pure*, in that they are associated with only one latent factor, whereas the remaining majority has multiple allocations. We prove that the corresponding allocation matrix $A$, and the induced overlapping clusters, are identifiable, up to label switching. We estimate the clusters with LOVE, our newly developed algorithm, which consists in two steps. The first step estimates the set of pure variables, and the number of clusters. In the second step we estimate the allocation matrix $A$ and determine the overlapping clusters. Under minimal signal strength conditions, our algorithm recovers the population level clusters consistently. Our theoretical results are fully supported by our empirical studies, which include extensive simulation studies that compare LOVE with other existing methods, and the analysis of a RNA-seq dataset.

**Keyword:** Overlapping clustering, latent model, identification, high dimensional estimation, group recovery, support recovery.

*Department of Statistical Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, USA; e-mail: fb238@cornell.edu.

†Department of Statistical Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, USA; e-mail: yn265@cornell.edu.

‡Department of Mathematics and Department of Statistical Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, USA; e-mail: marten.wegkamp@cornell.edu.

# 1 Introduction

The problem of building overlapping or non-overlapping sub-groups of a random vector $X =: (X_1, \ldots, X_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ from an observed sample $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ of $X$ is a common problem in applied research, for instance in neuroscience (Craddock et al., 2013, 2012) and genetics (Jiang et al., 2004; Wiwie et al., 2015), to give only a limited number of examples. The solutions are typically algorithmic in nature, and their quality is assessed against a ground scientific truth. Despite decades of algorithmic development that resulted in celebrated algorithms such as $K$-means (Lloyd, 1982) and its computationally fast relaxations (Arthur and Vassilvitskii, 2007; Kumar et al., 2004; Peng and Wei, 2007), hierarchical clustering (Izenman, 2008), or spectral clustering and its variants, see e.g. Von Luxburg (2007) and, more recently, their extensions for overlapping clustering (Krishnapuram et al., 2001; Bezdek, 2013), very little is known about the statistical accuracy of the thus obtained clusters when data consists in $n$ independent copies of $X$.

In contrast, model-based clustering methods for network data, and their theoretical guarantees, have been subject of extensive research in the last ten years. Network data consists in an observed $p \times p$ binary matrix, with entries typically assumed to be independent Bernoulli random variables. Models are then postulated on the expected value of this matrix. For instance, the stochastic block model is used for non-overlapping community assignment, and analyzed theoretically in a series of works, for instance Abbe and Sandon (2015); Guédon and Vershynin (2016); Le et al. (2016); Lei and Rinaldo (2015); Lei and Zhu (2014). Its generalizations are used for overlapping network clustering, e.g. Airoldi et al. (2008), Zhang et al. (2014) and the references therein.

In this work, we consider data of a completely different nature to network data. Our observed $n \times p$ data matrix will contain possibly continuous entries, and the entries in each row are correlated. Therefore, new models and new statistical methodology are needed for defining and estimating clusters of variables. Model-based procedures devoted to *non-overlapping* variable clustering, and their statistical accuracy, have been recently addressed in Bunea et al. (2016a) and Bunea et al. (2016b). The latter work also contains an in-depth discussion of the theoretical difficulty of translating methods developed for network clustering, chiefly spectral clustering, to the variable clustering framework.

To the best of our knowledge, no model-based statistical approaches, with theoretical guarantees, have been developed and analyzed for *overlapping* variable clustering. We propose a latent model approach, that extends in significant ways the framework proposed in Bunea et al. (2016b) for non-overlapping clustering. In addition to establishing the theoretical properties of our resulting procedure, we validate its practical relevance via a concrete application to gene clustering.

Specifically, if $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a zero-mean random variable, we assume that it follows the model

$$X = AZ + E, \tag{1}$$

where $Z =: (Z_1, \ldots, Z_K) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is a zero-mean vector of latent variables and $E$ is a zero-mean noise vector, with independent entries, and covariance matrix $\Gamma = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_p)$. The diagonal

entries $\sigma_j$ are allowed to differ. We assume that the $p \times K$ matrix $A$ satisfies the following model requirements:

(i) $A_{jk} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_{jk} = 1$, for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$.

(ii) For every $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$, there exists at least one index $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ such that $A_{jk} = 1$ and $A_{j\ell} = 0$ for all $\ell \neq k$.

(iii) $Cov(Z) = C = \text{diag}(\tau_k)$, with $\tau_k > 0$, for $1 \leq k \leq K$.

Requirement (i) allows each row $A_{j\cdot}$ to be sparse, in order to avoid that each variable $X_j$ is associated with all latent factors. The modeling condition (ii) requires that some components of $X$ are associated with only one latent factor and none of the others. Following the existing terminology in network clustering, we will call a variable $X_j$ satisfying requirement (ii) a *pure* variable. We note that in non-overlapping clustering, *all* $X_j$'s are assumed to be pure variables: subsets of components of $X$ are assumed to be connected with only one latent $Z_k$, and these subsets form a partition of the components of $X$. In contrast, in the current formulation only *some* of the entries of $X$ are assumed to be pure. We let $I$ denote the collection of all indices $j$ that satisfy (ii) and refer to this set as the pure-variable set. In the literature on non-overlapping clustering, the possible dependency between clusters is given by the dependency between the components of $Z$. Since our goal is to construct overlapping clusters, which are therefore dependent by construction, we assume throughout (iii).

The latent variables are used to define clusters, in that we place together all the components of $X$ that are associated with the same $Z_k$. Specifically, for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ we define

$$V_k =: \{j \in \{1, \ldots, p\} : \ A_{jk} \neq 0\}, \tag{2}$$

and let $V =: \{V_1, \ldots, V_K\}$. A cluster of variables will then contain all variables $X_j$, with $j \in V_k$, for some $k$. Since the same component of $X$ can be associated with more than one latent variable, the resulting clusters will be overlapping, and thus, as desired, $V$ is *not*, in general, a partition of $\{1, \ldots, p\}$. In this context, our contributions are:

**1. Uniquely defined overlapping clusters of variables**. The identifiability of Model (1) is notoriously difficult, as it is generally the case with any identifiability problem related to latent variable models. We prove, in Theorem 1 and Proposition 2 of Section 1.2, that conditions (i) - (iii) allow us to define $A$ uniquely, up to label switching, and hence to define uniquely our model-based overlapping clusters. Both quantities can be uniquely defined from $\Sigma$, the covariance matrix of $X$. We give counter-examples that show that if condition (ii) fails, identifiability may also fail.

**2. Estimation of the pure variable set $I$, in the presence of variables with multi-cluster association.** A crucial step in building overlapping clusters of a random vector $X$ based on Model (1) that satisfies (i) - (iii) is the determination of their *observable* anchors. Clusters are defined relative to the *un-observable* latent $Z_k$'s, and it is natural therefore to populate them first with

variables that are only associated with one such latent factor, respectively. Once the groups of pure variables are determined, the meaning of each cluster is clarified, and multi-cluster assignment becomes possible. In Section 2.1 we show how to estimate $I$, consistently and, moreover, how to estimate the number of clusters $K$ consistently. The input of our procedure is the sample covariance of $X$, which can be immediately estimated from the data, and a tuning parameter. Section 2.2 is devoted to a detailed analysis of a data dependent construction of this tuning parameter.

**3. Consistent estimation of the overlapping clusters.** We show in Section 2.3 how to construct an estimator $\widehat{A}$ that adapts to the unknown sparsity structure of the allocation matrix $A$. In Section 2.4 we employ the results of the previous sections to show that the overlapping clusters $V$ are recovered consistently by our procedure.

**4. A competitive new method for Latent model-based OVErlapping clustering: LOVE.** We conduct an extensive simulation study to assess the numerical quality of our proposed strategy. We present it in Section 3. To the best of our knowledge, there is a very limited number of comparable methods for overlapping clustering amenable to our type of data. All existing methods are of algorithmic nature, and none has statistical guarantees. We compare our procedure with two off-the-shelf algorithms, readily adaptable to our context: fuzzy K-means and fuzzy K-medoids. We show that our procedure has net superiority, when data is generated according to our model. Moreover, we find that LOVE is also competitive for non-overlapping clustering. This makes our method particularly appealing, as in practice it is difficult to assess what type of clusters one should expect. We conclude the validation of our approach with a data analysis, devoted to determining the functional annotation of genes with unknown function. Our analysis confirms existing biological ground truths, as our procedure tends to cluster together genes with the same Gene Ontology (GO) biological process, molecular function, or cellular component terms.

### 1.1 Notation

We use the following notation throughout this paper. For any $m \times d$ matrix $M$ and index sets $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$, we write $M_I$ to denote the $|I| \times d$ submatrix $(M_{ij})_{i \in I, 1 \leq j \leq d}$ of $M$ consisting of the rows in the index set $I$, while we denote the $|I| \times |J|$ submatrix with entries $M_{ij}$, $i \in I$, $j \in J$ by $M_{IJ}$. The $i$th row of $M$ is denoted by $M_{i\cdot}$, and the $j$th column of $M$ is denoted by $M_{\cdot j}$. Let $\|M\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq d} |M_{jk}|$, $\|M\|_F = (\sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^d M_{jk}^2)^{1/2}$, $\|M\|_{L_\infty} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sum_{k=1}^d |M_{jk}|$ denote the matrix sup norm, matrix Frobenius norm and matrix $L_\infty$ norm. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define $\|v\|_q = (\sum_{i=1}^d |v_j|^q)^{1/q}$ for $1 \leq q < \infty$, $\|v\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} |v_j|$ and $\|v\|_0 = |\mathrm{supp}(v)|$, where $\mathrm{supp}(v) = \{j : v_j \neq 0\}$ and $|A|$ is the cardinality of the set $A$. We write $M^T$ for the transpose of $M$ and $\mathrm{diag}(m_1, \dots, m_d)$ for the $d \times d$ diagonal matrix with elements $m_1, \dots, m_d$ on its diagonal, while $\mathrm{diag}(M)$ is the diagonal matrix obtained from the diagonal elements of a square matrix $M$. For two positive sequences $a_n$ and $b_n$, we write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if $C \leq a_n / b_n \leq C'$ for some constants $C, C' > 0$. Similarly, we use $a \lesssim b$ to denote $a \leq Cb$ for some

constant $C > 0$.

### 1.2 Identifiability

Before discussing cluster estimation, we need to establish that the allocation matrix $A$ given by Model (1) and (i) - (iii) is identifiable, up to permutation of columns.

We begin by observing that condition (i) is not sufficient for this purpose, as one can always construct an orthogonal matrix $Q$ such that $AZ = AQQ^{-1}Z$, with $AQ$ satisfying (i). We show below that the model requirement (ii) plays a key role in proving that $A$ is identifiable, up to permutation of its columns. The identifiability of $A$ will also ensure the identifiability of the grouping $V$. Intuitively, the pure variables $X_j$ defined via (ii) will anchor the groups: since each $Z_k$ defines a group, but is not observable, the $X_j$'s that are associated only with that $Z_k$ will be used as proxies for building the group, as they are observable. It is therefore crucial to establish that a given vector $X$ satisfying Model (1) and (i) - (iii) has a unique sub-set, with indices in $I$, of pure variables. Theorem 1 stated below and proved in the Appendix establishes this fact.

**Theorem 1.** Assume that Model (1) and (i) - (iii) hold. Then the pure variable set $I$ is uniquely defined by $\Sigma$. Moreover, if the induced latent model $X_j = Z_k + E_j$, for $j \in I_k$, holds for a minimal partition $\mathcal{I} =: \{I_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq K}$ of $I$ with $g =: \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} |I_k| > 1$, then this partition is unique up to the re-labeling of the groups of $\mathcal{I}$.

**Remark 1.** The proof of Lemma 1 of Bunea et al. (2016b), together with our condition (iii), show that we can allow for $\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} |I_k| = 1$, if we make the convention that $var(E_j) = \sigma_j = 0$, whenever $j \in I_k$, for some $k$ for which $|I_k| = 1$. In that case, $\Sigma_{jj} = C_{kk} = \tau_k$. In order to preserve the flow of the paper, we will not make this convention here, but we note that it can be made, and that all the results presented below continue to apply.

The identifiability of $A$ and $V$ follow from Theorem 1. We state the result in Proposition 2 below and prove it in the Appendix.

**Proposition 2.** Assume that Model (1) and (i) - (iii) hold, and that $g > 1$. Then, there exists a unique matrix $A$, up to permutation of columns, such that $X = AZ + E$. This implies that the associated overlapping clusters $V_k$, for $1 \leq k \leq K$, are identifiable, up to re-labeling.

**Remark 2.** We show below that the pure variable assumption (ii) is needed for the identifiability of $A$, up to permutations of its columns. Assume that $X = AZ + E$ satisfies (i) and (iii), but not (ii). We construct an example in which $X$ can also be written as $X = \widetilde{A}\widetilde{Z} + E$, where $\widetilde{A}$ and $\widetilde{Z}$ satisfy the same conditions (i) and (iii), respectively, but $\widetilde{A} \neq AP$ for any $K \times K$ permutation matrix $P$. To this end, we construct $\widetilde{A}$ and $\widetilde{Z}$ such that $\widetilde{A}\widetilde{Z} = AZ$. Let $\widetilde{A} = AQ$ and $\widetilde{Z} = Q^{-1}Z$, for some $K \times K$ invertible matrix $Q$ to be chosen. By condition (iii), $Q$ needs to satisfy $C = QCQ^T$.

In addition, we need to guarantee that $\widetilde{A} = AQ$ satisfies (i). For simplicity, we set $K = 2$. The following example satisfies all our requirements:

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & \sqrt{3/8} \\ -2\sqrt{3/8} & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to verify that $C = QCQ^T$ holds. For any $1 \leq j \leq p$, consider

$$A_{j\cdot} = (\frac{6+\sqrt{6}}{9}, \frac{3-\sqrt{6}}{9})$$

then

$$\widetilde{A}_{j\cdot} = A_{j\cdot}Q = (\frac{6-\sqrt{6}}{9}, \frac{3+\sqrt{6}}{9}),$$

which also satisfies condition (i). However, the matrix $A$ does not satisfy (ii), and is not identifiable.

# 2 Estimation

Our estimation procedure is done in the following steps: (1) Estimate the index set of pure variables $I$ and the submatrix $A_I$ of $A$ with rows $A_{i\cdot}$ that correspond to $i \in I$; (2) Estimate $A_J$, the submatrix of $A$ with rows $A_{j\cdot}$ that correspond to $j \in J =: \{1, \ldots, p\} \setminus I$; (3) Estimate the clusters $V$.

## 2.1 Estimation of the pure variable set

The proof of Theorem 1 of the previous section is constructive, and shows that for any given vector $X$ satisfying Model (1) and (i) - (iii) we can construct $I$ uniquely using only knowledge of the uniquely defined sparsity pattern of the covariance matrix $\Sigma$ of $X$. It relies on the crucial Lemma 10, stated and proved in the Appendix, which shows that rows of $\Sigma$ corresponding to a pure variable index are sparser than those corresponding to the index of a variable that is associated with multiple latent sources. This in turn gives us a rule for estimating $I$ iteratively, as summarized in Algorithm 1 below. It is noteworthy that the recovery of $I$ only utilizes the sparsity pattern on $\Sigma$, which is identical to that of $R$, the correlation matrix of $X$. For a more robust procedure of estimating $I$, we will work in this section with a sparse estimator of the correlation matrix. Specifically, given $n$ i.i.d. observations $X_1, ..., X_n$ satisfying Model (1), let $\widehat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T$ denote the sample covariance matrix. Consider the sample correlation matrix $\widehat{R} = [\widehat{\Sigma}_{ij}/(\widehat{\Sigma}_{ii}\widehat{\Sigma}_{jj})^{1/2}]_{1\leq i,j\leq p}$ and its sparse counterpart obtained via hard thresholding:

$$\widetilde{R} = (\widetilde{R}_{ij}) \text{ with } \widetilde{R}_{ij} = \widehat{R}_{ij} 1_{\{\widehat{R}_{ij} \geq \lambda\}}.$$

Given the crucial impact of the value of $\lambda > 0$ on our procedure, we will devote Section 2.2 below to a data-dependent construction. We assume this resolved for now, and for a given $\lambda$ we estimate $I$ using Algorithm 1 below.

**Algorithm 1** Estimate the set of pure variables $I$ by $\widehat{I}$

**Require:** I.I.D. data $(X_1, ..., X_n)$, where $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

Define $\widehat{M}_1 = \{1, 2, ..., p\}$. Set $k = 1$, and $\widehat{I} = \emptyset$.

**repeat**

Define

$$\widehat{N}_k = \left\{ i \in \widehat{M}_k : \|\widetilde{R}_{i\cdot}\|_0 \text{ is the smallest among } i \in \widehat{M}_k \right\},$$

$$\widehat{J}_k = \left\{ j \in \widehat{M}_k \setminus \widehat{N}_k : \exists i \in \widehat{N}_k \text{ such that } \widetilde{R}_{ij} > 0 \right\},$$

and $\widehat{I} \leftarrow \widehat{I} \cup \widehat{N}_k$. Let $\widehat{M}_{k+1} = \widehat{M}_k \setminus (\widehat{N}_k \cup \widehat{J}_k)$. Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$.

**until** $\widehat{M}_k = \emptyset$

**return** $\widehat{I}$.

We begin by showing, in Proposition 3 below, that the set $I$ can be estimated consistently from the data, provided that the signal is strong enough. The magnitude of the noise will depend on distributional assumptions on $X$. We assume that $X$ is sub-Gaussian, which is equivalent with assuming that the Orlicz norm of each $X_j$ is bounded by a common constant $c'$: $\max_{1\le j\le p} \|X_j\|_{\psi_2} \le c'$. The Orlicz norm of $X_j$ is defined as $\|X_j\|_{\psi_2} = \inf\{c > 0 : \mathbb{E}[\psi_2(|X_j|/c)] < 1\}$, based on the Young function $\psi_2(x) = \exp(x^2) - 1$.

Specifically, we assume that:

$$\text{(iv)} \quad \min_{1\le k\le K} \tau_k \ge \nu; \quad \min_{1\le k\le K} \min_{i,j\in V_k} (AA^T)_{ij} \ge c''' \sqrt{\log p/n}, \text{ for some constants } \nu, c''' > 0.$$

This condition places restrictions on $AA^T$, not directly on $A$ itself, as $AA^T$ and $C$ govern the signal in this problem. Since the sub-Gaussian assumption implies that $\max_{1\le j\le p} \Sigma_{jj} \le 2(c')^2$, condition (iv) implies that

$$\min_{1\le k\le K} \min_{i,j\in V_k} R_{ij} \ge \frac{c'''\nu}{2(c')^2} \sqrt{\log p/n},$$

which is the minimax lower bound on the entries of $R$ for which one can correctly estimate the sparsity pattern of $R$, and thus of $\Sigma$, from the data. The following proposition shows that Algorithm 1 yields a consistent estimator $\widehat{I}$ of $I$, under these minimal signal strength conditions, for a particular choice of $\lambda$, specified up to constants. The proof is given in the Appendix.

**Proposition 3.** If Model (1) and (i) - (iv) hold, $\log p = o(n)$, then $\widehat{I} = I$, for $\lambda = \frac{\nu c'''}{4(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$, with probability at least $1 - 2p^{2-\frac{\nu^2(c''')^2}{4\cdot 16^2 c''(c')^4}} - 2p^{2-\frac{\nu^2(c''')^2}{16^2 c''(c')^4}}$, where $c''$ is a constant which only depends on $c'$.

We conclude that we consistently estimate $I$ for suitable $\lambda$, provided $\nu c'''/(c')^2$, or

$$\sqrt{n/\log p}(\min_{1\le k\le K} \tau_k)(\min_{1\le k\le K} \min_{i,j\in V_k} (AA^T)_{ij})/\max_{1\le j\le p} \Sigma_{jj}$$

is large enough.

## 2.2 Data driven choice of the tuning parameter $\lambda$

While Proposition 3 specifies the rate of the threshold $\lambda$, the choice of the particular value of $\lambda$ is still unknown and depends on the observed data. To complement the theoretical results in Proposition 3, we propose a data driven method to choose $\lambda$. As we explained above, the proof of Proposition 3 shows that the value of $\lambda$ that allows for consistent estimation of $I$ is the value of $\lambda$ that allows for consistent estimation of the sparsity pattern of $R$ implied by Model (1) and (i) - (iii). We therefore offer a way of constructing a data dependent $\lambda$ for estimating this sparsity pattern. Our aim is to offer an easily implementable method, that also comes with theoretical guarantees. The standard $N$-fold cross validation methods are notoriously difficult to assess analytically. We therefore propose an alternative, based on data splitting. Specifically, we split the data set in three independent parts, of equal sizes. On the first and second set, respectively, we calculate the sample correlation matrices $\widehat{R}^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{R}^{(2)}$. On the third set, we construct a family $\mathcal{F} = \{S_1, \ldots, S_M\}$ of *sparsity* sets, where $S_l =: \{(i,j) : \widehat{R}^{(3)}_{ij} < \lambda_l\}$ for $1 \leq l \leq M$ and each $S_l$ corresponds to a different threshold $\lambda_l = c_l\sqrt{\log p/n}$ on a grid for $c_l$. We assume that the correct pattern $S^o = \{(i,j) : R_{ij} = 0\}$ is in $\mathcal{F}$. To ensure that this is the case we choose a very fine, large, grid of values for $\lambda$, by varying the proportionality constant given in its theoretical definition, as Proposition 3 guarantees that the correct sparsity pattern is recovered, with high probability, for $\lambda$ proportional to $\sqrt{\log p/n}$.

Following Bunea et al. (2016a), we propose to use the following criterion. For each $S \in \mathcal{F}$, we define

$$CV(S) =: \sum_{i<j} \left(\widehat{R}^{(1)}_{ij} - \widehat{R}^{(2)}_{ij} 1_{\{(i,j)\notin S\}}\right)^2 w_{ij}(S),$$

where $w_{ij}(S) = 1_{\{(i,j)\in S\}} + 1_{\{(i,j)\notin S\}}\delta_n$ for some $\delta_n$ which gives different weights to pairs $(i,j) \in S$ and $(i,j) \notin S$. In practice, we find that the choice of $\delta_n = \lambda^{-1/4}$ usually yields satisfactory results. We note that the construction of each $S = S_l$ employs the corresponding $\lambda = \lambda_l$, and thus the corresponding $\delta_{n,l} = \lambda_l^{-1/4}$. In our criterion, the cross validation error for those $(i,j) \notin S$ is weighted heavier than the other error. Intuitively, this weight favors a larger threshold $\lambda$ which leads to a more sparse estimator $\widetilde{R}$. We then select $\widehat{S} = \arg\min_{S\in\mathcal{F}} CV(S)$. The following proposition shows that for any $S \neq S^o$, $\mathbb{E}[CV(S)] > \mathbb{E}[CV(S^o)]$.

**Proposition 4.** Assume that Model (1) and (i) - (iii) hold. Let $a_n = \max_{1\leq l\leq M} \delta_{n,l}$. For any sequence $\delta_{n,l} \geq 1$, if the condition $\min_{(i,j)\notin S^o} R_{ij} \geq (2C_1 a_n/n)^{1/2}$ holds for some constant $C_1$, which only depends on the constant $c'$ of the sub-Gaussian assumption on $X$, then $\mathbb{E}[CV(S^o)] < \mathbb{E}[CV(S)]$ for any $S \neq S^o$.

We notice that, from a theoretical perspective, we could take $\delta_n = 1$, but our intensive simulation results suggest that the choice $\delta_n = \lambda^{-1/4}$ is to be preferred.

Our data dependent construction of $\lambda$ is aimed directly at finding the correct sparsity pattern of $R$, in finite samples. An alternative approach is to re-visit the definition of $\lambda$, which is simply the smallest value that bounds $\|\widehat{R} - R\|_\infty$, with high probability. A data dependent determination of

this value can be obtained as soon as the distribution of $\|\widehat{R}-R\|_\infty$ can be estimated from the data. Clearly, the exact distribution is not, in general, available, but asymptotic approximations of it exist. However, methods based on asymptotic approximations, may require a large amount of data to reach a desired level of accuracy. The typical criticism of the data-splitting based methods also regards the amount of data needed for their application. On the positive side, both data-splitting and the asymptotic approaches allow for theoretical guarantees.

With this trade-off in mind, we compared our proposed method with two alternatives motivated by asymptotic approximations and explained below. Our extensive simulation study indicates that our proposal is highly competitive, for moderate sample sizes, with clear advantages in high dimensions. For uniformity of comparison, in the simulation study presented in this section we consider Gaussian data.

We consider the following two derivations of the data-dependent cut-off $\lambda$, based on two different asymptotic approximations.

1. We let $W =: \max_{i<j} n^{1/2}|\widehat{R}_{ij} - R_{ij}|$. Relatively recently Chernozhukov et al. (2013) showed that the limiting distribution of $W$ is that of the maximum of a sequence of correlated Gaussian random variables. In practice, Chernozhukov et al. (2013) further showed that this limiting distribution can be approximated by the following Gaussian multiplier bootstrap method. Let $e_1, ..., e_n$ denote an i.i.d sample from $N(0,1)$, independent of the data. Consider the statistics

$$W_e = \max_{k<j} \Big| \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[ \frac{X_{ij}X_{ik}}{(\widehat{\Sigma}_{jj}\widehat{\Sigma}_{kk})^{1/2}} - \frac{X_{ij}^2 \widehat{R}_{jk}}{2\widehat{\Sigma}_{jj}} - \frac{X_{ik}^2 \widehat{R}_{jk}}{2\widehat{\Sigma}_{kk}} \Big] e_i \Big|.$$

Then the 95% quantile of $W$ can be approximated by $t_{0.95} = \inf\{t \in R : \mathbb{P}_e(W_e \leq t) \geq 0.95\}$, where $\mathbb{P}_e(A)$ denotes the probability of the event $A$ with respect to $e_1, ..., e_n$. To evaluate $\mathbb{P}_e(W_e \leq t)$, one can generate the random variables $e_1, ..., e_n$ $B^*$ times and look at the empirical distribution of $W_e$. This strategy leads to $\lambda = t_{0.95}/n^{1/2}$. This method is referred to as the Max method. Naturally, other values than 0.95 can be considered.

2. Another, more conservative, approach is based on the widely used Bonferroni correction, that allows control of $\|\widehat{R} - R\|_\infty$ via individual controls of $|\widehat{R}_{ij} - R_{ij}|$. We first note that the sparsity of the sample correlation matrix $\widehat{R}$ coincides with that of its Fisher z-transformation $\widehat{F}$, where for $1 \leq j < k \leq p$,

$$\widehat{F}_{jk} = \frac{1}{2} \log \Big( \frac{1 + \widehat{R}_{jk}}{1 - \widehat{R}_{jk}} \Big).$$

Under the assumption that $X$ has a Gaussian distribution, it is known that $n^{1/2}(\widehat{F}_{jk} - F_{jk})$ converges weakly to $N(0,1)$, where $F_{jk} = \frac{1}{2}\log(\frac{1+R_{jk}}{1-R_{jk}})$. Let $z_\alpha$ denote the $\alpha$ quantile of $N(0,1)$. Applying the Bonferroni method to control the FWER at level 0.05, the cut-off used for estimating the sparsity of $F$, and thus that of $R$, is given by $\lambda = z_{(1-\frac{0.1}{p(p-1)})}/n^{1/2}$. This method is referred to as the Bonferroni method.




Figure 1: Proportion of correct recovery of the sparsity pattern of $\Sigma$ for different $n$ and $p = 40$ and $p = 500$.

Figure 1 clearly shows that our CV method outperforms the Max and Bonferroni methods in terms of recovering the sparsity pattern of $R$, when $p$ is large. The 90% recovery percentage is reached when $n = 400$ and $p = 500$, whereas the asymptotic approximations require a sample size more than $n = 1000$ to match this performance.

### 2.3 Estimation of the allocation matrix $A$

Given the different nature of their entries, we estimate the submatrices $A_I$ and $A_J$ separately. For the former, we only need to estimate the identifiable partition $\mathcal{I} = \{I_1, \dots, I_K\}$ of $I$, where $I_k =: \{j \in I : A_{jk} = 1\}$ for any $1 \leq k \leq K$. Proposition 3 above guarantees that $I$ can be estimated consistently by $\widehat{I}$. However, the sets $\widehat{N}_j$ returned by Algorithm 1 of Section 2.1, by construction, do not necessarily form a partition of $\widehat{I}$. In order to estimate this partition and the number of clusters $K$, we apply the CORD algorithm developed in Bunea et al. (2016a) to the submodel $X_I = A_I Z + E_I$ for $X_I \in \mathbb{R}^q$, the vector containing only pure variables, with $q = |I|$. Under (iii), the minimal partition $\mathcal{I}$ for which $X_I$ has a latent decomposition is identifiable. Bunea et al. (2016a) guarantees that $\mathcal{I}$, and therefore $K$, can also be estimated consistently, as soon as $\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \tau_k \gtrsim \sqrt{\log p / n}$, which automatically holds under our assumption (iv). We construct the $\widehat{I} \times K$ submatrix $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{I}}$ with rows $j \in \widehat{I}$ consisting of $K-1$ zeroes and one entry equal to 1, as $\widehat{A}_{jk} = 1$, if $j \in \widehat{I}_k$ and zero otherwise. The estimation of the partition $\mathcal{I}$ and $A_I$ is summarized in Algorithm 2.

We will estimate the matrix $A_J$ row by row. To facilitate notation further, we rearrange $\Sigma$ and

**Algorithm 2** Estimate the partition of $I$ and $A_I$

**Require:** The estimated pure variables $(X_{1\widehat{I}}, ..., X_{n\widehat{I}})$

Apply the CORD algorithm in Bunea et al. (2016a) to $(X_{1\widehat{I}}, ..., X_{n\widehat{I}})$.

**return** The number of groups $\widehat{K}$, the partition of $\widehat{I}$, that is $\widehat{I}_1, ..., \widehat{I}_{\widehat{K}}$, and the estimator $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{I}}$, where $\widehat{A}_{jk} = 1$ if $j \in \widehat{I}_k$ and zero otherwise for any $1 \le k \le \widehat{K}$.

$A$ as follows:

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{II} & \Sigma_{IJ} \\ \Sigma_{IJ} & \Sigma_{JJ} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } A = \begin{bmatrix} A_I \\ A_J \end{bmatrix}.$$

Model (1) implies the following decomposition of the covariance matrix of $X$:

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{II} & \Sigma_{IJ} \\ \Sigma_{JI} & \Sigma_{JJ} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_I C A_I^T & A_I C A_J^T \\ A_J C A_I^T & A_J C A_J^T \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{II} & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma_{JJ} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular,

$$\Sigma_{IJ} = A_I C A_J^T,$$

and, moreover, using the definition of $A_I$, we also have

$$H = C A_J^T,$$

where $H$ is the $K \times (p-q)$ matrix obtained from $\Sigma_{IJ}$ by extracting one row corresponding to each group $I_k$ from the partition of $I$, i.e., $H =: (H_{\cdot 1}, ..., H_{\cdot(p-q)})$ with $H_{kj} = \Sigma_{ij}$ for any $i \in I_k$. We recall that, under condition (i) of our model formulation, each row of $A_J$ satisfies $A_{j\cdot} \in F_K$, where

$$F_K =: \{v \in \mathbb{R}^K : v_j \ge 0, \text{ for any } 1 \le j \le K, \|v\|_1 = 1\}.$$

Let $j \in \widehat{J} =: \{1, \ldots, p\} \setminus \widehat{I}$ be arbitrary, fixed, and for ease of notation we write $\beta := A_{j\cdot}^T$ and $H_{\cdot j} =: h \in \mathbb{R}^K$, so that $h = C\beta$. We can estimate the $k$th entry of $h$ by

$$\widehat{h}_k = \frac{1}{|\widehat{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \widehat{I}_k} \widehat{\Sigma}_{ij},$$

and compute

$$\widehat{\tau}_k = \frac{1}{(|\widehat{I}_k| - 1)|\widehat{I}_k|} \sum_{i,j \in \widehat{I}_k, i \ne j} \widehat{\Sigma}_{ij}$$

to form $\widehat{C} = \text{diag}(\widehat{\tau}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\tau}_{\widehat{K}})$. We use the restricted least squares estimator

$$\widehat{\beta} = \arg\min_{\beta \in \widehat{F}} \|\widehat{h} - \widehat{C}\beta\|_2^2 \tag{3}$$

to estimate the row $\beta$ of $A_J$. The minimization is over $\beta \in \widehat{F} = F_{\widehat{K}}$. We can stack $\widehat{\beta}$ together to construct the estimator $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{J}}$. Together with the estimator $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{I}}$ in the output of Algorithm 2, this forms the estimator $\widehat{A}$.

The following proposition shows that the estimator of $A$ thus constructed is $\sqrt{n}$-consistent with respect to the supremum norm, up to logarithmic factors, and that, moreover, each of its rows adapts to the unknown sparsity of the corresponding row in $A$. Let $s_j$ denote the number of non-zero elements in a row of $A_{j\cdot}$, for each $j \in J$.

**Proposition 5.** Under the same conditions as in Proposition 3 and $g > 1$, $\widehat{I} = I$ and $\widehat{K} = K$, with probability larger than $1 - c_1 p^{-c_2}$ for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Moreover, for some permutation $\pi : \{1, \ldots, K\} \to \{1, \ldots, K\}$:

(a) $\widehat{I}_j = I_{\pi(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, K$.

Let $\bar{A} = [A_{\cdot\pi(1)} \cdots A_{\cdot\pi(k)}]$ be the matrix that is obtained after permuting the columns of $A$ according to $\pi$. If (a) holds, then we immediately have $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{I}} = \bar{A}_I$, and we further have

(b) $\|\widehat{A} - \bar{A}\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{\log p/n}$;

(c) $\|\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T - \bar{A}\bar{A}^T\|_\infty = \|\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T - AA^T\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{\log p/n}$;

(d) $\max_{j\in J} \|\widehat{A}_{j\cdot} - \bar{A}_{j\cdot}\|_1 \lesssim s\sqrt{\log p/n}$; $\max_{j\in J} \|\widehat{A}_{j\cdot} - \bar{A}_{j\cdot}\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{s \log p/n}$, where $s = \max_{j\in J} s_j = \max_{j\in J} \sum_{k=1}^K 1\{A_{jk} \neq 0\}$.

All statements (a)-(d) hold with probability larger than $1 - c_1 p^{-c_2}$ for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

### 2.4 Estimation of the overlapping groups

We begin by giving an equivalent definition of the groups $V_1, \ldots, V_K$ defined by equation (2).

**Lemma 6.** Assume Model (1) and (i) - (ii) hold, and $g > 1$. The $K$ groups

$$V_k = \{j : \ A_{jk} \neq 0\}, \ 1 \leq k \leq K,$$

formed by the non-zero elements in the columns of $A$, correspond to the $K$ distinct groups formed by the non-zero elements in the columns of the sub-matrix $(AA^T)_{\cdot s}$ with $s \in I = I_1 \cup \ldots \cup I_K$:

$$V_k = \{j : (AA^T)_{js} \neq 0, \text{ for some } s \in I_k\} \tag{4}$$

*Proof.* Recall that for our model with $g \geq 2$, the partition $\mathcal{I} = \{I_1, \ldots, I_K\}$ is identifiable. By the definition of $I_k$, for any fixed $k$ and $s \in I_k$ we have $A_{sk} = 1$ and $A_{sl} = 0$, for $l \neq k$. Therefore $(AA^T)_{js} = A_{jk}A_{sk} = A_{jk}$, and so $(AA^T)_{js} \neq 0$ if and only if $A_{jk} \neq 0$, and the result follows. □

The following example illustrates this, with groups given by $V_1 = \{1, 2, 7\}, V_2 = \{3, 4, 8\}, V_3 = \{5, 6, 7, 8\}$.

**Example 7.**

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 1/3 & 2/3 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad AA^T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1/2 & 2/3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1/2 & 2/3 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 1/3 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/3 & 1/3 & 2/3 & 2/3 & 1/3 & 5/9 \end{pmatrix}$$

Let $\mu$ be a thresholding level to be defined later. Define

$$\widehat{V}_k = \{j : (\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T)_{js} \geq \mu, \text{ for some } s \in \widehat{I}_k\}. \tag{5}$$

Then, the overlapping groups can be estimated consistently, as stated in the following proposition and proved in the appendix.

**Proposition 8.** Under the same conditions as in Proposition 3 and $g > 1$, with $\mu = \frac{c'''}{2}\sqrt{\log p/n}$, we have: $\widehat{V}_k = V_{\pi(k)}$, for some permutation $\pi$, and for each $1 \leq k \leq K$, with probability larger than $1 - c_1 p^{-c_2}$ for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

In Figure 2, we evaluate the empirical performance of the estimated groups formed by different values of $\mu$. For simplicity, we use the same data generating procedures as in the simulation studies in Section 3. Given the estimator $\widehat{A}$, we define $\widetilde{A}$ to be the matrix formed by the permutation of columns of $\widehat{A}$ such that it agrees with the alignment of $A$. We further define the false positive rate (FPR) and false negative rate (FNR) of $\widetilde{A}$ in (9). We defer the detailed definitions to Section 3. Figure 2 confirms that there exists a wide range of the $\mu$ values that yield reasonably small FNR and FPR. In particular, the choice of $\mu = \sqrt{\log p/n}$ works well in practice. Although one should use a data driven method similar to that proposed in Section 2.2 for data analysis, for the purpose of simulation studies this becomes computationally extensive. To balance the group recovery accuracy and computational cost, our recommendation is to fix $\mu = \sqrt{\log p/n}$. Further simulation results in Section 3 confirm this choice. For the readers' convenience, we summarize our LOVE method in Algorithm 3.

## 2.5 Extension to Gaussian Copula Models

Our approach for constructing overlapping clusters can be extended to the Gaussian copula model. Given the random vector $X = (X_1, ..., X_p)$, we assume that there exist unknown monotonic transformations $f = (f_1, ..., f_p)$ such that $f(X) =: (f_1(X_1), ..., f_p(X_p))$ satisfies the latent variable model

$$f(X) = AZ + E, \tag{6}$$




Figure 2: FNR and FPR based on different cut-off $\mu$ when $p = 100, n = 500$ and $p = 1000, n = 500$. In practice, we set $\mu = \sqrt{\log p/n}$, which yields $\mu = 0.10$ and $0.12$, respectively, in these two scenarios.

**Algorithm 3** The LOVE procedure for overlapping clustering.

**Require:** I.I.D. data $(X_1, ..., X_n)$, where $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

1. Apply Algorithm 1 to obtain the estimated set of pure variables $\widehat{I}$.
2. Apply Algorithm 2 to find the number of clusters $\widehat{K}$, partition of $\widehat{I}$ and form $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{I}}$.
3. Estimate $A_J$ by $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{J}}$, where each row of $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{J}}$ is given by the restricted least squares estimator (3).

**return** The estimator of the allocation matrix $\widehat{A}$ and the estimated overlapping groups $\widehat{V} = \{\widehat{V}_1, ..., \widehat{V}_{\widehat{K}}\}$ by (5).

where $f(X) \sim N(0, ACA^T + \Gamma)$ with $A$, $Z$ and $E$ all defined in equation (1). We make the model identifiable by assuming $\text{diag}(R) = I$, where $R = ACA^T + \Gamma$ is the copula correlation matrix.

Let $\tau_{jk} = \mathbb{E}(\text{sign}\left\{\left(X_{ij} - X_{i'j}\right)\left(X_{ik} - X_{i'k}\right)\right\})$ for $i \neq i'$. Simple calculation shows that $R_{jk} = \sin(\frac{\pi}{2}\tau_{jk})$. Thus, the correlation matrix $R$ is identifiable based on the knowledge of $X$. It is easy to see that Theorem 1 and Proposition 2 still hold for the latent Gaussian copula model (6). Thus, the matrix $A$ in (6) is uniquely defined up to permutations of columns. To estimate the set $I$ of pure variables and the allocation matrix $A$, we can use the same algorithm with the sample correlation matrix $\widehat{R}$ replaced by the rank based estimator $\widehat{R}^{(\tau)}$, where $\widehat{R}^{(\tau)}_{jk} = \sin(\frac{\pi}{2}\widehat{\tau}_{jk})$ and $\widehat{\tau}_{jk}$ is the Kendall's tau estimator

$$\widehat{\tau}_{jk} \quad = \quad \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < i' \leq n} \text{sign}\left\{\left(X_{ij} - X_{i'j}\right)\left(X_{ik} - X_{i'k}\right)\right\}. \tag{7}$$

Under the same conditions, Propositions 3, 5 and 8 hold for the algorithm with $\widehat{R}^{(\tau)}$ due to the following concentration inequality implied by Hoeffding's inequality for U-statistics (Hoeffding, 1963).

**Lemma 9.** For $n$ large enough and $t > 0$, the estimator $\widehat{R}^{(\tau)}$ satisfies,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{R}^{(\tau)} - R\|_\infty \leq 8\pi t\right) \geq 1 - p^2 \exp\left(-nt^2\right).$$

## 3 Simulation Studies

To evaluate the performance of the proposed method, we consider the following data generating procedures. We set the number of clusters $K$ to be 3, and the number of pure variables in each cluster to be $7, 6$ and $7$, each of which is substantially smaller than the total number of variables $p$ to be specified later. We simulate the latent variables $Z = (Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)$ from $N(0, C)$, where $C = \text{diag}(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3)$ with $\tau_1 = 1, \tau_2 = 1.5$ and $\tau_3 = 2$. In addition, the errors $E_1, ..., E_p$ are independently sampled from $N(0, \sigma_p)$, where $\sigma_p$ follows from the uniform distribution in $[1, 2]$. To generate $A_J$, for any $j \in J$, we set $A_{j\cdot} = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$, $A_{j\cdot} = (0, 1/2, 1/2)$, $A_{j\cdot} = (1/2, 0, 1/2)$ or $A_{j\cdot} = (1/2, 1/2, 0)$ with equal probability (i.e., 0.25 for each case). Thus, we can generate $X$ according to the model $X = AZ + E$. In the simulation studies, we vary $p$ from 100 to 1000 and $n$ from 300 to 1000. Each simulation is repeated 50 times.

### 3.1 Comparison with other overlapping clustering algorithms

In this section, we compare the proposed method with the following overlapping clustering algorithms: fuzzy K-means, and fuzzy K-medoids (Krishnapuram et al., 2001), the latter being more robust to noise and outliers. We describe the methods briefly in what follows. Both of them aim to estimate a degree of membership matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times K}$ by minimizing the average within-cluster $L_2$ or $L_1$ distances (Bezdek, 2013). Specifically, denote $\widetilde{X}_j = (X_{1j}, ..., X_{nj})$, and $\widetilde{X} = \{\widetilde{X}_1, ..., \widetilde{X}_p\}$.

Let $W = \{w_1, ..., w_K\}$, where $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$, be a subset of $\widetilde{X}$ with $K$ elements. The fuzzy algorithms aim to find the set $W$ such that $J(W)$ defined as

$$J(W) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=1}^{K} M_{jk} r(\widetilde{X}_j, w_k),$$

is minimized. Here, $M_{jk}$ can be interpreted as the degree of membership matrix which is a known function of $r(\widetilde{X}_j, w_k)$. Some commonly used expressions of $M_{jk}$ are shown by Krishnapuram et al. (2001). In addition, $r(\widetilde{X}_j, w_k)$ is a measure of dissimilarity between $\widetilde{X}_j$ and $w_k$. For instance, if $r(x, y) = \|x - y\|_2^2$, this corresponds to the fuzzy K-means. Similarly, the fuzzy K-medoids is given by $r(x, y) = \|x - y\|_1$. Since searching over all possible subsets of $\widetilde{X}$ is computationally infeasible, an approximate algorithm for minimizing $J(W)$ is proposed by Krishnapuram et al. (2001), we refer to their original paper for further details.

Their degree of membership matrix $M$ plays the same role as our allocation matrix $A$, but is typically non-sparse. In order to construct overlapping clusters based on $M$ one needs to specify a cut-off value $v$ and assign variable $j$ to cluster $k$ if $M_{jk} > v$. Moreover, the number of clusters $K$ is a required input of the algorithm. In the simulations presented in this section we set $K = 3$ for these two methods, which have been implemented by the functions `FKM` and `FKM.med` in R.

We compare their performance with LOVE, our proposed method. We emphasize that our method does not require the specification of $K$ and that the tuning parameters are chosen in a data adaptive fashion, as explained in the previous sections. We follow the pairwise approach of Wiwie et al. (2015) for this comparison. Recall that $V = (V_1, ..., V_K)$ denotes the true overlapping clusters. For notational simplicity, we use $\widehat{V} = (\widehat{V}_1, ..., \widehat{V}_{\bar{K}})$ to denote clusters computed from an algorithm. Since LOVE estimates the number of clusters, we allow $\bar{K}$ to be different from $K$. For any pair $1 \leq j < k \leq p$, define

$$TP_{jk} = 1 \text{ if } j, k \in V_i \text{ and } j, k \in \widehat{V}_l \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq K \text{ and } 1 \leq l \leq \bar{K},$$

and 0 otherwise. Similarly, we define

$$TN_{jk} = 1 \text{ if } j, k \notin V_i \text{ and } j, k \notin \widehat{V}_l \text{ for any } 1 \leq i \leq K \text{ and } 1 \leq l \leq \bar{K},$$

$$FP_{jk} = 1 \text{ if } j, k \notin V_i \text{ for any } 1 \leq i \leq K \text{ and } j, k \in \widehat{V}_l \text{ for some } 1 \leq l \leq \bar{K},$$

and

$$FN_{jk} = 1 \text{ if } j, k \in V_i \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq K \text{ and } j, k \notin \widehat{V}_l \text{ for any } 1 \leq l \leq \bar{K}.$$

Otherwise, we set these measures to be 0. Then, we define

$$TP = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq p} TP_{jk}, \; TN = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq p} TN_{jk}, \; FP = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq p} FP_{jk}, \; FN = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq p} FN_{jk}.$$




Figure 3: Plot of specificity and sensitivity for fuzzy K-means and fuzzy K-medoids with respect to the choice of the cut-off $v$ when $n = 500$ and $p = 500$.

We use sensitivity (SN) and specificity (SP) to evaluate the performance of different methods, where

$$SP = \frac{TN}{TN + FP}, \text{ and } SN = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}. \tag{8}$$

Recall that for the fuzzy methods, variable $j$ belongs to cluster $k$ if the estimated membership matrix $M_{jk}$ is beyond a cut-off $v$, i.e., $M_{jk} > v$. In Figure 3, we examine the performance of the fuzzy methods with different cut-offs. We observe that small values of $v$ lead to low specificity, whereas large values of $v$ imply low sensitivity. It seems that setting $v = 0.3$ and $v = 0.35$ in the fuzzy K-means and fuzzy K-medoids respectively, attains a good trade-off between sensitivity and specificity. Hereafter, we fix $v = 0.3$ and $v = 0.35$ in the fuzzy K-means and fuzzy K-medoids to compare with the proposed method.

The corresponding sensitivity and specificity for LOVE, fuzzy K-means (F-Kmeans) and fuzzy K-medoids (F-Kmed) are shown in Figure 4. To save space, we only present the results for a low dimensional case (i.e., $p = 100$) and a high dimensional case (i.e., $p = 700$). The other scenarios illustrate the same patterns and are omitted. The following findings are observed. First, all methods except F-Kmed have high specificity, which implies low false positives. In other words, most methods rarely group two variables together if they do not belong to the same group in the data generating procedure. Second, in terms of sensitivity, LOVE outperforms all other existing methods. For instance, the sensitivity of the proposed method is very close to 1, which shows that our method has very few false negatives. The conclusions hold under both low dimensional case and high dimensional case with $n$ from 300 to 1000. Moreover, we re-emphasize that the true value $K = 3$ is used as input by the competing methods, whereas it is estimated from the data in LOVE.

This illustrates the net advantage of the proposed method over the existing overlapping clustering methods, for data generated from Model (1).




Figure 4: Plot of specificity and sensitivity for LOVE, fuzzy K-means (F-Kmeans), and fuzzy K-medoids (F-Kmed).

### 3.2 Estimation error and cluster recovery with LOVE

In this section, we aim to conduct a more careful investigation on the performance of LOVE in terms of clustering and estimation accuracy. Recall that the true allocation matrix $A$ and our estimator $\widehat{A}$ are not directly comparable, since they may differ by a permutation matrix. To evaluate the performance of our method, instead of the pairwise approach used in the previous section, we consider the following mapping approach (Wiwie et al., 2015). If $A$ and $\widehat{A}$ have the same dimension, we first find the mapping (i.e., the permutation matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times K}$) such that $\|A - \widehat{A}P\|_F$ is minimized. Thus, we can compare the permuted estimator $\widetilde{A} = \widehat{A}P$ with $A$ to

evaluate the estimation error and recovery error. Under this mapping approach, we can define false positive rate (FPR) and false negative rate (FNR) as follows:

$$FPR = \frac{\sum_{1\le j\le p, 1\le k\le K} 1_{\{A_{jk}=0, \widetilde{A}_{jk}>0\}}}{\sum_{1\le j\le p, 1\le k\le K} 1_{\{A_{jk}=0\}}},\ FNR = \frac{\sum_{1\le j\le p, 1\le k\le K} 1_{\{A_{jk}>0, \widetilde{A}_{jk}=0\}}}{\sum_{1\le j\le p, 1\le k\le K} 1_{\{A_{jk}>0\}}}. \tag{9}$$

Figure 5 shows the percentage of exact recovery of the partition of pure variables $\mathcal{I} = \{I_1, ..., I_K\}$, percentage of exact recovery of number of clusters $K$, FPR and FNR. Since FPR and FNR are defined if $\text{rank}(\widehat{A}) = K$, we only compute these two measures when the number of clusters is correctly identified. We can see that the proposed method successfully recovers the partition of pure variables and our data driven cross validation procedure correctly selects $K$ provided $n \geq 500$. The three way split in the cross validation tends to require a larger sample size and becomes a bottleneck when $n$ is small and $p$ is large (e.g., $n = 300$ and $p = 1000$). But, the recovery rate is still beyond 60%. In addition, as long as the number of clusters is correctly selected, both FPR and FNR of our method are very close to 0, which implies that the sparsity pattern of $A$ can be correctly recovered. Finally, we present the average estimation error of $\widehat{A}$ as measured by the matrix $L_\infty$ norm and matrix sup-norm, as well as the Frobenius norm scaled by $1/(pK)^{1/2}$, in Table 1. As expected, the estimation error decreases when the sample size increases from 300 to 1000, which is in line with our theoretical results. The simulations are conducted on an OS X system version 10.9.5 with 2.6 GHz Intel Core i5 CPU and 8 GB memory. Even with $p = 1000$ and $n = 1000$, the computing time of our method for each simulation takes less than 1 minute, and seems comparable to many other existing clustering methods.

While our simulation studies are limited to the case that the number of clusters $K$ is small and the nonzero components of $A_J$ are relatively large, we also test our LOVE method for $K$ as large as 10 and with many weak signals in $A_J$. The results are consistent with what we observed in this section and deliver the same message. To save space, we omit the results.

### 3.3 LOVE for non-overlapping cluster estimation

In applications, one may not have prior information on whether the clusters may overlap or not. Thus, one would prefer a clustering method that works well in both overlapping and non-overlapping scenarios. In the previous section, we have demonstrated that LOVE outperforms the existing clustering methods if data is generated from a model that yields variable clusters with overlap. In this section, we study the numerical performance of the proposed method under non-overlapping data generating schemes.

To generate data with non-overlapping clusters, we set the number of pure variables in each cluster to be $p/K$, where $K = 5$. Recall that the variance $C$ of the latent variable $Z$ is $C = \text{diag}(\tau_1, ..., \tau_K)$. We generate $\tau_k$ from the uniform distribution in $[1, 2]$. In addition, the variance $\sigma_j$ of the error $E_j$ also follows from the uniform distribution in $[1, 2]$. In Table 2, we compare the sensitivity and specificity of the proposed method with the CORD estimator (Bunea et al., 2016a)




Figure 5: Percentage of exact recovery of the partition of pure variables $I_1, ..., I_K$ (pure), percentage of exact recovery of number of clusters $K$ (cluster), false positive rate (FPR) and false negative rate (FNR) for LOVE.

Table 1: The average estimation error of $\widehat{A}$ as measured by the matrix $L_\infty$ norm (Inf), matrix sup-norm (Max) and the Frobenius (F) norm (divided by $(pK)^{1/2}$). Numbers in parentheses are the simulation standard errors.

| $p$ | $n = 300$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | Max | Inf | F | Max | Inf | F | Max | Inf |
| 100 | 0.0025 | 0.16 | 0.32 | 0.0020 | 0.14 | 0.29 | 0.0014 | 0.10 | 0.21 |
| | (0.0075) | (0.09) | (0.05) | (0.0046) | (0.04) | (0.04) | (0.0029) | (0.02) | (0.03) |
| 300 | 0.0016 | 0.18 | 0.37 | 0.0012 | 0.14 | 0.29 | 0.0008 | 0.10 | 0.20 |
| | (0.0043) | (0.04) | (0.06) | (0.0033) | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.0033) | (0.02) | (0.03) |
| 500 | 0.0013 | 0.19 | 0.39 | 0.0010 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 0.0007 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| | (0.0052) | (0.05) | (0.07) | (0.0046) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.0026) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| 700 | 0.0010 | 0.20 | 0.37 | 0.0009 | 0.14 | 0.26 | 0.0006 | 0.10 | 0.20 |
| | (0.0048) | (0.05) | (0.06) | (0.0037) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.0032) | (0.03) | (0.04) |
| 1000 | 0.0009 | 0.18 | 0.39 | 0.0007 | 0.15 | 0.33 | 0.0005 | 0.12 | 0.24 |
| | (0.0042) | (0.04) | (0.07) | (0.0035) | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.0035) | (0.04) | (0.04) |

under non-overlapping scenarios, where the sensitivity and specificity are defined in (8). The CORD estimator can be viewed as a benchmark method for variable clustering without overlapping and

is shown to outperform K-means and hierarchical clustering, via an extensive numerical study presented in Bunea et al. (2016a). For this reason, we only focus on the comparison between LOVE and CORD. From Table 2, we see that for $n = 300$ the sensitivity of the proposed method LOVE is slightly worse than CORD, especially when the dimension $p$ is large (e.g., $p = 1000$). The reason might be that the three way split in the cross validation procedure requires a larger sample size when $p$ is large. However, as $n$ increases to 500, LOVE performs almost the same as the benchmark estimator. This confirms that the proposed method also works well under non-overlapping scenarios.

Table 2: Sensitivity (SN) and specificity (SP) of the proposed method (LOVE) and CORD under non-overlapping scenarios. Numbers in parentheses are the simulation standard errors.

| $p$ | $n = 300$ | | | | $n = 500$ | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LOVE | | CORD | | LOVE | | CORD | |
| | SN | SP | SN | SP | SN | SP | SN | SP |
| 100 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| | (0.20) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| 500 | 0.88 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| | (0.40) | (0.06) | (0.07) | (0.00) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| 1000 | 0.76 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| | (0.48) | (0.08) | (0.01) | (0.00) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.00) |

## 4 Application

To benchmark LOVE, we study a publicly available RNA-seq dataset of 285 blood platelet samples from patients with different malignant tumors (Best et al., 2015). We extract a small subset of 500 Ensembl genes to test the method. The goal of the benchmarking is to test whether (i) clusters correspond to biological knowledge, in which we use the Gene Ontology (GO) functional annotation (Ashburner et al., 2000) of the genes, (ii) overlapping clusters correspond to pleiotropic gene function. LOVE producs ten overlapping clusters (Table 3) which aligns well with a-priori expectation. Table 3 lists the number of pure genes and the total number of genes in ten overlapping clusters. Among 500 genes, a majority of genes (i.e., 361 genes) are assigned to at least two different clusters. Figure 6 further gives us a more clear picture on how two clusters possibly overlap. For example, 17 genes belong to both cluster 1 and cluster 10, whereas cluster 9 and cluster 10 have no overlaps at all. The genes with the same GO biological process, molecular function or cellular component terms tend to be assigned to the same cluster. For example, ENSG00000273487 and

ENSG00000272865 are both RNA genes/non-coding RNA. They are both assigned to the same cluster (cluster 4 in Figure 7). However, they are also assigned to other clusters, consistent with pleiotropic/multiple functions of non-coding RNAs. This suggests that the latent variables used for clustering are likely to have biological significance and can potentially be used for functional discovery for genes with underexplored functions.

Table 3: Number of pure genes and total number of genes in each group.

| | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of pure genes | 8 | 69 | 4 | 13 | 16 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 7 |
| Total number of genes | 53 | 91 | 31 | 101 | 329 | 10 | 7 | 53 | 10 | 300 |




Figure 6: Number of genes overlapped in different groups. The nodes represent 10 groups with the same labels as those in Table 3. The number shown on the edge between two nodes represents the number of genes shared by the two groups.

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Jishnu Das for help with the interpretation of our data analysis results.




Figure 7: Illustration of three genes ENSG00000272865, ENSG00000273487 and ENSG00000273423 and their allocation matrix relative to 10 groups. For instance, the $j$th gene ENSG00000272865 belongs to groups 4 and 7 with $\widehat{A}_{j4} = 0.44, \widehat{A}_{j7} = 0.56$.

# Appendix

## Proof of Theorem 1

The proof will make repeated use of the following simple, yet crucial, Lemma 10 which shows that rows of $\Sigma$ corresponding to a pure variable index are sparser than those corresponding to the index of a variable that is associated with multiple latent sources, hence-forth called "non-pure". We begin by stating and proving this lemma.

**Lemma 10.** Let $\Sigma$ be the covariance matrix of a random variable $X$ satisfying Model (1) and (i) - (iii). If $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ is a non-pure variable index, then there exists a pure-variable index $i_1 \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, which is necessarily different than $i$, such that

$$\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0 > \|\Sigma_{i_1\cdot}\|_0.$$

*Proof.* If $i$ is a non-pure variable index, then by its definition there exist $1 \leq k_1 \neq k_2 \leq K$ such that $A_{ik_1} > 0$ and $A_{ik_2} > 0$. If $i_1$ is a pure-variable index then, by condition (ii), $A_{i_1k_1} = 1$ and $A_{i_1l} = 0$ for any $l \neq k_1$. Since $k_1 \neq k_2$ then, once again by condition (ii), there exist $i_2 \neq i_1$, such that $A_{i_2k_2} = 1$ and $A_{i_2l} = 0$ for any $l \neq k_2$. As $i$ is not a pure variable index, $i_1$, $i_2$ and $i$ are all different. Then, we have:

$$\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0 = \Big\| \sum_{\ell=1}^{K} A_{i\ell}\tau_\ell A_{\cdot\ell} \Big\|_0 \geq \Big\| A_{ik_1}\tau_{k_1}A_{\cdot k_1} + A_{ik_2}\tau_{k_2}A_{\cdot k_2} \Big\|_0 = \|A_{\cdot k_1} + A_{\cdot k_2}\|_0,$$

where the last step follows from $A_{ik_1}, A_{ik_2} > 0$ and $\tau_{k_1}, \tau_{k_2} > 0$. Since $A_{i_2k_1} = 0$ and $A_{i_2k_2} = 1$, we further have

$$\|A_{\cdot k_1} + A_{\cdot k_2}\|_0 \geq \|A_{\cdot k_1}\|_0 + 1.$$

Finally, we make the crucial observation that the number of non-zero elements of a column in $A$ coincides with the number of non-zero elements in a row of $\Sigma$ corresponding to some pure variable. Specifically, since $A_{i_1l} = 0$ for any $l \neq k_1$, we have:

$$\|A_{\cdot k_1}\|_0 = \|A_{i_1k_1}A_{\cdot k_1}\|_0 = \Big\| \sum_{\ell=1}^{K} A_{i_1\ell}\tau_\ell A_{\cdot\ell} \Big\|_0 = \|\Sigma_{i_1\cdot}\|_0. \tag{10}$$

Thus, we conclude that $\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0 \geq \|\Sigma_{i_1\cdot}\|_0 + 1$. □

*Proof of Theorem 1.* To prove this result, we consider the following constructive approach. Let $M_1 = \{1, ..., p\}$. Define

$$N_1 = \arg\min_{i \in M_1} \|(\Sigma)_{i\cdot}\|_0, \;\; J_1 = \{j \in M_1 \setminus N_1 : \exists i \in N_1 \; \textit{such that} \;\; (\Sigma)_{ij} \neq 0\},$$

where the arg min denotes the set of minimizers, if the minimum is achieved by more than one index. Similarly, define $M_2 = M_1 \setminus (N_1 \cup J_1)$, we can then define $N_2$ and $J_2$ as

$$N_2 = \arg\min_{i \in M_2} \|(\Sigma)_{i\cdot}\|_0, \;\; J_2 = \{j \in M_2 \setminus N_2 : \exists i \in N_2 \; \textit{such that} \;\; (\Sigma)_{ij} \neq 0\}.$$

We repeat the procedure to define $M_3, N_3, J_3, ..., M_{m-1}, N_{m-1}, J_{m-1}$ until $M_m = M_{m-1} \setminus (N_{m-1} \cup J_{m-1})$ becomes an empty set for some $m > 1$. The proof proceeds in the two steps.

First, we prove that $\cup_{k=1}^{m-1} N_k$ yields the collection of the indices of all pure variables, that is we show that $\cup_{k=1}^{m-1} N_k = I$. Since each $N_k$ is uniquely defined by the unique sparsity pattern of $\Sigma$, this will prove that $I$ is identifiable. We will use mathematical induction to show that for any $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, we have $N_k \subseteq I$ and $J_k \cap I = \emptyset$.

We first prove that this statement holds for $k = 1$, by contradiction. Assume that there exists a non-pure variable with index $i$ in $N_1$. Then, by Lemma 10, there exists a pure variable index $i_1$ such that $\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0 > \|\Sigma_{i_1\cdot}\|_0$. Since $\|\Sigma_{i_1\cdot}\|_0$ is smaller than $\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0$, this contradicts the definition of $N_1$.

Next, we prove that no pure variable indices are placed in $J_1$, that is we show that $J_1 \cap I = \emptyset$. We only need to consider the case when $J_1$ is non-empty. Given any index $j$ in $J_1$, we have $(\Sigma)_{ij} \neq 0$, for some pure variable index $i \in N_1$. Since $\Sigma_{ij} \neq 0$, we have $\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_{ik}\tau_k A_{jk} \neq 0$. Then there exists $1 \leq k \leq K$ such that $A_{ik} > 0$ and $A_{jk} > 0$. If $j \in I$, then $A_{ik} = A_{jk} = 1$ and $A_{ik'} = A_{jk'} = 0$ for any $k' \neq k$. By (10), this implies $\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0 = \|A_{\cdot k}\|_0 = \|\Sigma_{j\cdot}\|_0$. By the definition of $N_1$, this further implies $j \in N_1$, which leads to a contradiction. These together imply that $j \notin I$ for any $j \in J_1$.

To complete the induction step, we assume that $N_k \subseteq I$ and $J_k \cap I = \emptyset$ hold for all $k \leq r$. We will prove $N_{r+1} \subseteq I$ and $J_{r+1} \cap I = \emptyset$, once again by contradiction.

Assume that there exists a non-pure variable index $i \in N_{r+1}$. Then, there exists $1 \leq \ell_1 \neq \ell_2 \leq K$ such that $A_{i\ell_1} > 0$ and $A_{i\ell_2} > 0$. In addition, we have $1 \leq j, k \leq p$, such that $A_{j\ell_1} = 1$ and $A_{j\ell} = 0$ for any $\ell \neq \ell_1$ and $A_{k\ell_2} = 1$ and $A_{k\ell} = 0$ for any $\ell \neq \ell_2$. Then, by Lemma 10,

$$\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0 \geq \|\Sigma_{j\cdot}\|_0 + 1. \tag{11}$$

Denote $\bar{N}_r = \cup_{k=1}^{r} N_k$ and $\bar{J}_r = \cup_{k=1}^{r} J_k$. To obtain the desired contradiction, we consider three cases.

1 First, assume that $j, k \notin \bar{N}_r$. By the induction step $\bar{J}_r \cap I = \emptyset$, we have $j, k \notin \bar{J}_r$. This implies $j, k \in M_{r+1}$. Noting that (11) holds, this contradicts the fact that, by the definition of $N_{r+1}$, index $i$ has the smallest $\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0$ within the set $M_{r+1}$.

2 Suppose $j \in N_a$ for some $a \leq r$. Note that $\Sigma_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_{ik}\tau_k A_{jk} \neq 0$. However, according to the definition of $J_a$, we obtain $i \in J_a$ if $i \in M_r$. Otherwise, we have $i \notin M_r$. In both cases, $i$ cannot belong to $N_{r+1}$, which leads to a contradiction.

3 Suppose $k \in N_a$ for some $a \leq r$. The same argument in case (2) can be applied.

Thus, combining all these three cases, we establish $N_{r+1} \subseteq I$. Next, we prove $J_{r+1} \cap I = \emptyset$.

Given any $j \in J_{r+1}$, we have $\Sigma_{ij} \neq 0$ for some index $i \in N_{r+1}$ that corresponds to a pure variable. Since $\Sigma_{ij} \neq 0$, we have $\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_{ik}\tau_k A_{jk} \neq 0$. Then there exists $1 \leq k \leq K$ such that $A_{ik} > 0$ and $A_{jk} > 0$. If $j \in I$, then $A_{ik} = A_{jk} = 1$ and $A_{ik'} = A_{jk'} = 0$ for any $k' \neq k$. By (10),

this implies $\|\Sigma_{i\cdot}\|_0 = \|A_{\cdot k}\|_0 = \|\Sigma_{j\cdot}\|_0$. By the definition of $N_{r+1}$, this implies $j \in N_{r+1}$, which contradicts with the fact that $j \in J_{r+1}$. These facts together imply that $j$ is not a pure variable index, for any $j \in J_{r+1}$. This completes the proof of $J_{r+1} \cap I = \emptyset$.

To complete the proof of the theorem, let $X_I \in \mathbb{R}^q$, with $q = |I|$, be the sub-vector of $X$ containing only pure variables. Then, it satisfies the "reduced pure variable" model

$$X_I = A_I Z + E_I, \tag{12}$$

where $E_I$ is obtained from $E$ by retaining the entries corresponding to $I$, and $A_I$ denotes the $q \times K$ matrix with entries in $\{0, 1\}$ induced by condition (ii). When $g > 1$, Lemma 1 in Bunea et al. (2016b) ensures the existence of a unique partition $\mathcal{I}$ of $I$ with respect to which the above latent decomposition holds. The partition can be uniquely determined from $\Sigma_I$. Since we have showed above that $I$ can also be uniquely determined, this concludes our proof. □

## Proof of Proposition 2

Theorem 1 above shows that $\Sigma$ uniquely defines $I$ and its partition $\mathcal{I}$, up to relabeling. Given $I$ and its partition $\mathcal{I} = \{I_1, \ldots, I_K\}$, for any $a \in I$, there exists a unique $1 \le k \le K$ such that $a \in I_k$. Then we set $A_{a\cdot} = e_k$, the canonical basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^K$ that contains 1 in position $k$ and is zero otherwise. Thus, the $|I| \times K$ matrix $A_I$ with rows $A_{a\cdot}$ is uniquely defined up to permutations of columns, that is, up to labeling the sets in $\mathcal{I}$. For $1 \le k \le K$, we can pick one pure node $i_k$ in each $I_k$, that is $i_k \in I_k$. Denote $T = \{i_1, .., i_K\}$ and $J = \{1, ..., p\} \backslash I$. The set $T$ is arranged such that the submatrix $A_T$ is the $K \times K$ identity matrix. By the definition of $\Sigma$, for each $j \in J$, we have $\Sigma_{Tj} = A_T C A_{j\cdot}^T = C A_{j\cdot}^T$. Recall that $C = \mathrm{diag}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_K)$. It can be uniquely determined from $\Sigma$ via

$$\tau_k = \frac{1}{(|I_k| - 1)|I_k|} \sum_{i,j \in I_k, i \neq j} \Sigma_{ij},$$

whenever $g = \min_{1 \le k \le K} |I_k| \ge 2$ holds. Since $\Sigma_{Tj}$ depends on the underlying partition, and $\det(C) > 0$ by condition (ii), we find that $A_{j\cdot}^T = C^{-1} \Sigma_{Tj}$ is also uniquely defined, up to permutations of columns, for each $j$. □

## Proof of Proposition 3

We begin by stating lemmas needed in the proof of this proposition.

**Lemma 11.** Assume that $X_j$ for any $1 \le j \le p$ is sub-Gaussian with bounded sub-Gaussian norm, i.e., $\max_{1 \le j \le p} \|X_j\|_{\psi_2} \le c'$. Then the sample correlation matrix $\widehat{R} = (\widehat{R}_{ab})$ defined as $\widehat{R}_{ab} = \widehat{\Sigma}_{ab} / (\widehat{\Sigma}_{aa} \widehat{\Sigma}_{bb})^{1/2}$, satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{R} - R\|_\infty \ge t) \le 2p^2 \exp\Big( - \frac{nt^2}{16c''} \Big)$$

for any $0 < t \le 2$, where $c''$ is a constant which only depends on $c'$.

*Proof.* Let us denote $\widehat{S}_{ab} = \widehat{\Sigma}_{ab}/(\Sigma_{aa}\Sigma_{bb})^{1/2}$, which can be also written as $n^{-1}\sum_{k=1}^{n} Y_{ka}Y_{yb}$, where $Y_{ka} = X_{ka}/\Sigma_{aa}^{1/2}$. By Lemma 1 in the supplementary file of Bunea et al. (2016a), $\|\widehat{R} - R\|_\infty \leq 2\|\widehat{S} - R\|_\infty$. In addition, by inequality (31) of Bien et al. (2016),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{S} - R\|_\infty \geq t) &\leq p^2 \max_{a,b} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|n^{-1}\sum_{k=1}^{n} Y_{ka}Y_{yb} - R_{ab}\right| \geq t\right) \\ &\leq 2p^2 \exp\left(-\frac{n^2t^2(\Sigma_{aa}\Sigma_{bb})}{2[v_{ab} + c_{ab}(\Sigma_{aa}\Sigma_{bb})^{1/2}tn]}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $v_{ab} = c''n(\Sigma_{aa}\Sigma_{bb})$ and $c_{ab} = c''(\Sigma_{aa}\Sigma_{bb})^{1/2}$ for some constant $c''$ which only depends on $c'$. Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{S} - R\|_\infty \geq t) \leq 2p^2 \exp\Big(-\frac{t^2 n}{2c''(1+t)}\Big).$$

Combining with $\|\widehat{R} - R\|_\infty \leq 2\|\widehat{S} - R\|_\infty$ and using the condition $t \leq 2$, we obtain the result. □

**Lemma 12.** Under the condition in Proposition 3 and $\lambda \leq \frac{\nu c'''}{4(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$, then

$$\|\widetilde{R} - R\|_\infty \leq \frac{3\nu c'''}{8(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}},$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{2-\frac{\nu^2(c''')^2}{4\cdot 16^2 c''(c')^4}}$.

*Proof.* Lemma 11 implies that, we have with probability at least $1 - 2p^{2-\frac{\nu^2(c''')^2}{4\cdot 16^2 c''(c')^4}}$,

$$\|\widehat{R} - R\|_\infty \leq \frac{\nu c'''}{8(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}.$$

This implies,

$$\|\widetilde{R} - R\|_\infty \leq \|\widetilde{R} - \widehat{R}\|_\infty + \|\widehat{R} - R\|_\infty \leq \lambda + \frac{\nu c'''}{8(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \leq \frac{3\nu c'''}{8(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}.$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 3.* By Lemma 12, the event $\{\|\widetilde{R} - R\|_\infty \leq \frac{3\nu c'''}{8(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}\}$ holds with probability at least $1 - 2p^{2-\frac{\nu^2(c''')^2}{4\cdot 16^2 c''(c')^4}}$. Then, under this event for any $(i,j) \in \mathrm{supp}(R)$ and $i \neq j$,

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{R}_{ij} &\geq R_{ij} - |\widetilde{R}_{ij} - R_{ij}| = A_{i\cdot}CA_{j\cdot}^T/(\Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{jj})^{1/2} - |\widetilde{R}_{ij} - R_{ij}| \\ &\geq A_{i\cdot}CA_{j\cdot}^T/(\Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{jj})^{1/2} - \frac{3\nu c'''}{8(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \geq \frac{\nu(AA^T)_{ij}}{2(c')^2} - \frac{3\nu c'''}{8(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \\ &\geq \frac{\nu c'''}{8(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(i,j) \in \text{supp}(\widetilde{R})$. Similarly, Lemma 11 implies that the event $\{\|\widehat{R} - R\|_\infty \leq \frac{\nu c'''}{4(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}\}$ holds with probability at least $1 - 2p^{2-\frac{\nu^2(c''')^2}{16^2 c''(c')^4}}$. For any $(i,j) \notin \text{supp}(R)$, we have $R_{ij} = 0$. Under this event, this implies that $\widetilde{R}_{ij} = 0$ because $\widehat{R}_{ij} = \widehat{R}_{ij} - R_{ij} \leq \lambda$ with $\lambda = \frac{\nu c'''}{4(c')^2}\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$. Thus, $(i,j) \notin \text{supp}(\widetilde{R})$. Combining above results, we obtain $\text{supp}(\Sigma) = \text{supp}(R) = \text{supp}(\widetilde{R})$ with probability at least $1 - 2p^{2-\frac{\nu^2(c''')^2}{4\cdot 16^2 c''(c')^4}} - 2p^{2-\frac{\nu^2(c''')^2}{16^2 c''(c')^4}}$. To complete the proof we note that, in the proof of Theorem 1, the sets $N_1, J_1, ..., N_{m-1}, J_{m-1}$ only depend on the sparsity pattern of $\Sigma$ or, equivalently, the sparsity pattern of $R$. Thus, the event

$$\left\{\widehat{N}_1 = N_1, \widehat{J}_1 = J_1, ..., \widehat{N}_{m-1} = N_{m-1}, \widehat{J}_{m-1} = J_{m-1}\right\}$$

holds with high probability. As $I = \cup_{k=1}^{m-1} N_k$ and $\widehat{I} = \cup_{k=1}^{m-1} \widehat{N}_k$, $\widehat{I} = I$ holds accordingly with high probability. □

## Proof of Proposition 4

Consider any $S = S_l$ and $\delta_n = \delta_{n,l}$. By the definition of $CV(S)$, it is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
CV(S^o) - CV(S) &= \sum_{i<j,(i,j)\in S;(i,j)\notin S^o} \left\{\left(\widehat{R}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{R}_{ij}^{(2)} 1_{\{(i,j)\notin S^o\}}\right)^2 \delta_n - \left(\widehat{R}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{R}_{ij}^{(2)} 1_{\{(i,j)\notin S\}}\right)^2\right\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i<j,(i,j)\notin S,(i,j)\in S^o} \left\{\left(\widehat{R}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{R}_{ij}^{(2)} 1_{\{(i,j)\notin S^o\}}\right)^2 - \left(\widehat{R}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{R}_{ij}^{(2)} 1_{\{(i,j)\notin S\}}\right)^2 \delta_n\right\} \\
&= \sum_{i<j,(i,j)\in S;(i,j)\notin S^o} \left\{\left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(2)}\right)^2 \delta_n - \left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} + R_{ij}\right)^2\right\} \qquad (13) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i<j,(i,j)\notin S,(i,j)\in S^o} \left\{\left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)}\right)^2 - \left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(2)}\right)^2 \delta_n\right\}, \qquad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(t)} = \widehat{R}_{ij}^{(t)} - R_{ij}$ for $t = 1, 2$. By Lemma 1 in the supplementary file of Bunea et al. (2016a), for any $1 \leq i < j \leq p$, we have $|\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(t)}| \leq |\widehat{S}_{ii}^{(t)} - R_{ii}| + |\widehat{S}_{jj}^{(t)} - R_{jj}| + |\widehat{S}_{ij}^{(t)} - R_{ij}|$, where $\widehat{S}_{ij}^{(t)} = \widehat{\Sigma}_{ij}^{(t)}/(\Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{jj})^{1/2}$. By the proof of Lemma 11, for any $0 \leq t \leq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(t)}| \geq t) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{S}_{ii}^{(t)} - R_{ii}| \geq t/3) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{S}_{jj}^{(t)} - R_{jj}| \geq t/3) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{S}_{ij}^{(t)} - R_{ij}| \geq t/3) \\
&\leq 6\exp\Big(-\frac{n_t t^2}{18c''(1+t/3)}\Big) \leq 6\exp\Big(-\frac{n_t t^2}{30c''}\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

where $c''$ is a positive constant defined in Lemma 11. Then, we define $\delta = 30c''/n_t$, and this leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
E[(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(t)})^2] &\leq \delta + \int_\delta^2 \mathbb{P}((\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(t)})^2 \geq t)dt \leq \delta + 6\int_\delta^2 \exp\Big(-\frac{n_t t}{30c''}\Big)dt \\
&\leq \delta + 6\frac{30c''}{n_t}\exp\Big(-\frac{n_t\delta}{30c''}\Big) = \frac{C}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

where for simplicity we assume $n_t = n/3$ and $C = 630c''$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(2)})^2 \delta_n] \leq 4\delta_n \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)})^2] \leq \frac{4C\delta_n}{n}.$$

Let $C_1 = 5C + 1$. By the condition $\min_{(i,j)\notin S^o} R_{ij} \geq (2C_1 a_n/n)^{1/2} \geq (2C_1\delta_n/n)^{1/2}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} + R_{ij})^2] \geq \frac{1}{2}R_{ij}^2 - \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)})^2] \geq \frac{C_1\delta_n}{n} - \frac{C}{n}.$$

Thus, for each component in (13), its expectation is less than 0, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(2)}\right)^2 \delta_n - \left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} + R_{ij}\right)^2\right\} \leq -\frac{(C_1 - 4C)\delta_n - C}{n} < 0,$$

where the last step follows from $(C_1 - 4C)\delta_n - C \geq C\delta_n - C > 0$, since $C_1 > 5C$ and $\delta_n \geq 1$.

Let $\mathbb{E}^{(t)}$ denote the expectation for the $t$th set of data, $t = 1, 2$. Finally, for each component in (14), similar to the case 1 in the proof of Proposition 10 in Bunea et al. (2016a),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{(1)}\mathbb{E}^{(2)}\left\{\left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)}\right)^2 - \left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} - \widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(2)}\right)^2 \delta_n\right\} &< \mathbb{E}^{(1)}\left\{\left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)}\right)^2 - \left(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)} - \mathbb{E}^{(2)}[\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(2)}]\right)^2 \delta_n\right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^{(1)}[(\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij}^{(1)})^2](1 - \delta_n) \leq -\frac{(\delta_n - 1)C}{n} \leq 0,\end{aligned}$$

where the first strict inequality follows by the Jensen inequality and the last inequality holds by $\delta_n \geq 1$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}[CV(S^o)] < \mathbb{E}[CV(S)]$ for any $S \neq S^o$. □.

## Proof of Proposition 5

*Proof of (a).* By Proposition 3, the event $E_1 = \{\widehat{I} = I\}$ holds with probability at least $1 - c_1 p^{-c_2}$. Consider the event $E_2 = \{\widehat{K} = K, \widehat{I}_k = I_{\pi(k)}$ for any $1 \leq k \leq K$ and some permutation $\pi\}$. Following Bunea et al. (2016a), $\mathbb{P}(E_2^c \cap E_1) \leq c_1 p^{-c_2}$ for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Thus, $E_2$ holds with high probability by the simple inequality $\mathbb{P}(E_2^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(E_2^c \cap E_1) + \mathbb{P}(E_1^c)$. Thus, we obtain $\widehat{A}_{\widehat{I}} = \bar{A}_I$.

For the remainder of the proof, *we work on the event $E_1 \cap E_2$ and we relabel the partition of the set $\widehat{I}$ in such a way that $\widehat{I}_k = I_k$ for all $k$.* This means that $A = \bar{A}$. Recall that $H =: (H_{\cdot 1}, ..., H_{\cdot(p-q)})$ with $H_{kj} = \Sigma_{ij}$ for any $i \in I_k$. Let $\widehat{H} = (\widehat{H}_{\cdot 1}, ..., \widehat{H}_{\cdot(p-q)})$. For simplicity, we denote $h = H_{\cdot j}$ and $\widehat{h} = \widehat{H}_{\cdot j}$.

**Lemma 13.** Under the conditions in Proposition 5, there exist some constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$, such that

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq K} |\widehat{\tau}_i - \tau_i| \leq c_3\sqrt{\log p/n}, \quad \|\widehat{H} - H\|_\infty \leq c_3\sqrt{\log p/n},$$

with probability at least $1 - c_1 p^{-c_2}$.

*Proof.* Note that

$$|\widehat{h}_k - h_k| \leq \frac{1}{|I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_k} |\widehat{\Sigma}_{ij} - \Sigma_{ij}| \leq \|\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_\infty,$$

and

$$|\widehat{\tau}_k - \tau_k| \leq \frac{1}{(|I_k| - 1)|I_k|} \sum_{i \neq j \in \widehat{I}_k} |\widehat{\Sigma}_{ij} - \Sigma_{ij}| \leq \|\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_\infty.$$

The result follows directly from Lemma 2 in Bien et al. (2016) that with probability at least $1 - c_1 p^{-c_2}$,

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_\infty \leq c_3 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}},$$

for some constant $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$. □

*Proof of (b).* For notational simplicity, we assume that the event $E_2$ holds. Recall that $C = \text{diag}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_K)$ and $\widehat{C} = \text{diag}(\widehat{\tau}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\tau}_K)$. We have that $h = C\beta$ is non-negative. Hence we may set $\widehat{h}_i = 0$ if $\widehat{h}_i < 0$; so without loss of generality, we may assume $\widehat{h}_i \geq 0$. The estimator $\widehat{\beta}$ defined by (3) satisfies the following KKT conditions: there exist unique $\mu$ and $\lambda = (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_K)^T$ such that

$$-2\widehat{C}(\widehat{h} - \widehat{C}\widehat{\beta}) + \mu \mathbf{1} - \lambda = 0, \tag{15}$$

$$\text{st} \quad \lambda_i \geq 0, \widehat{\beta}_i \geq 0, \lambda_i \widehat{\beta}_i = 0, \|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 = 1. \tag{16}$$

From (15), we can solve $\widehat{\beta}_i$ as

$$\widehat{\beta}_i = \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} + \frac{\lambda_i}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2} - \frac{\mu}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2}; \ 1 \leq i \leq K.$$

It is immediate to see that, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ we further have:

$$\widehat{\beta}_i = \left( \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{\mu}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2} \right) 1_{[2\widehat{h}_i \widehat{\tau}_i > \mu]}.$$

Let $L =: \{i : 2\widehat{h}_i \widehat{\tau}_i > \mu\}$. We evaluate now the bounds for $|\widehat{\beta}_i - \beta_i|$, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$.

If $i \in L$, we have

$$|\widehat{\beta}_i - \beta_i| \leq |\widehat{\tau}_i^{-1} \widehat{h}_i - \tau_i^{-1} h_i| + \widehat{\tau}_i^{-2} |\mu|/2.$$

If $i \notin L$, we have

$$|\widehat{\beta}_i - \beta_i| = |-\beta_i| \leq |\widehat{\tau}_i^{-1} \widehat{h}_i - \tau_i^{-1} h_i| + \widehat{\tau}_i^{-1} \widehat{h}_i \leq |\widehat{\tau}_i^{-1} \widehat{h}_i - \tau_i^{-1} h_i| + \widehat{\tau}_i^{-2} |\mu|/2.$$

We conclude that

$$\max_i |\widehat{\beta}_i - \beta_i| \leq \max_i \left\{ \left| \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right| + \frac{|\mu|}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2} \right\}.$$

In what follows, we establish a bound on $|\mu|$. Note that

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \widehat{\beta}_i = \sum_{i \in L} \widehat{\beta}_i = \sum_{i \in L} \left( \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{\mu}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2} \right),$$

so that, using the true parameter satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{K} \tau_i^{-1} h_i = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \beta_i = 1$, we obtain

$$\mu = \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in L} \frac{1}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2}} \left\{ \sum_{i \in L} \left( \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right) - \sum_{i \notin L} \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right\}.$$

In order to bound $|\mu|$, we consider two cases:
$\mu < 0$, in which case $L = \{1, ..., K\}$, and so

$$\mu = \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in L} \frac{1}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2}} \left\{ \sum_{i \in L} \left( \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right) \right\}.$$

$\mu \geq 0$: Using $h_i/\tau_i \geq 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in L} \frac{1}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2}} \left\{ \sum_{i \in L} \left( \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right) - \sum_{i \notin L} \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in L} \frac{1}{2\widehat{\tau}_i^2}} \left\{ \sum_{i \in L} \left( \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|\mu| \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in L} 2^{-1} \widehat{\tau}_i^{-2}} \sum_{i \in L} \left| \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right|.$$

We conclude that

$$\max_i |\widehat{\beta}_i - \beta_i| \leq \max_i \left\{ \left| \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right| + \frac{1}{\widehat{\tau}_i^2} \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in L} \widehat{\tau}_i^{-2}} \sum_{i \in L} \left| \frac{\widehat{h}_i}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\tau_i} \right| \right\}.$$

Recall that $\beta = A_{j\cdot}^T$ for any $j \in J$. Pooling over $j$ together, we have

$$\|\widehat{A}_{\widehat{J}} - A_J\|_\infty \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p-q} \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \left\{ \left| \frac{\widehat{H}_{ij}}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{H_{ij}}{\tau_i} \right| + \frac{1}{\widehat{\tau}_i^2} \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in L} \widehat{\tau}_i^{-2}} \sum_{i \in L} \left| \frac{\widehat{H}_{ij}}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{H_{ij}}{\tau_i} \right| \right\}. \tag{17}$$

Note that Lemma 13 implies $\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} |\widehat{\tau}_i - \tau_i| \lesssim (\log p/n)^{1/2}$ and $\|\widehat{H} - H\|_\infty \lesssim (\log p/n)^{1/2}$ with high probability. Together with $\min_i \tau_i > \nu$, we get $\min_i \widehat{\tau}_i > \nu/2$ with high probability. In addition, by $\max_i \tau_i \leq \nu'$ where $\nu' = 2(c')^2$, we get $\|H\|_\infty \leq \max_i \tau_i \leq \nu'$ and $\|\widehat{H}\|_\infty \leq 2\nu'$ with high probability. By adding and subtracting terms, we get

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq p-q} \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \left| \frac{\widehat{H}_{ij}}{\widehat{\tau}_i} - \frac{H_{ij}}{\tau_i} \right| \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p-q} \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \left\{ \frac{\widehat{H}_{ij}}{\widehat{\tau}_i \tau_i} |\widehat{\tau}_i - \tau_i| + \frac{1}{\tau_i} |\widehat{H}_{ij} - H_{ij}| \right\} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}},$$

and

$$\max_{1\le j\le p-q}\max_{1\le i\le K}\frac{1}{\sum_{i\in L}\widehat{\tau}_i^{-2}}\sum_{i\in L}\left|\frac{\widehat{H}_{ij}}{\widehat{\tau}_i}-\frac{H_{ij}}{\tau_i}\right|$$
$$\le \max_{1\le i\le K}\frac{L}{\sum_{i\in L}\widehat{\tau}_i^{-2}}\max_{1\le j\le p-q}\max_{1\le i\le K}\left|\frac{\widehat{H}_{ij}}{\widehat{\tau}_i}-\frac{H_{ij}}{\tau_i}\right|\lesssim\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}.$$

Plugging these results into (17), we get $\|\widehat{A}_{\widehat{J}}-A_J\|_\infty\lesssim(\log p/n)^{1/2}$. Together with part (a) of this proposition, we show that $\|\widehat{A}-A\|_\infty\lesssim\sqrt{\log p/n}$ with high probability.

*Proof of (c).* The result follows immediately from

$$\max_{1\le i,j\le p}|(\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T)_{ij}-(AA^T)_{ij}|\le\max_{1\le i,j\le p}\left\{|(\widehat{A}_{i\cdot}-A_{i\cdot})\widehat{A}_{j\cdot}^T|+|A_{i\cdot}(\widehat{A}_{j\cdot}-A_{j\cdot})^T|\right\}$$
$$\le 2\|\widehat{A}-A\|_\infty\lesssim\sqrt{\log p/n},$$

where in the last step we use the sup-norm bound for $\widehat{A}-A$ which we have already derived in part (b) above.

*Proof for (d).* By the definition of $\widehat{\beta}$, we have

$$\|\widehat{h}-\widehat{C}\widehat{\beta}\|_2^2\le\|\widehat{h}-\widehat{C}\beta\|_2^2,$$

where $\beta=A_{j\cdot}^T$ is the true value of $\beta$. Denote $\widehat{\delta}=\widehat{\beta}-\beta$. Then

$$\|\widehat{C}\widehat{\delta}\|_2^2\le 2(\widehat{h}-\widehat{C}\beta)^T\widehat{C}\widehat{\delta}. \tag{18}$$

Similar to the proof of (c), with high probability, the event $E_3=\{\min_i\widehat{\tau}_i\ge\nu/2\}$ holds. Under this event, we have

$$\frac{\nu^2}{4}\|\widehat{\delta}\|_2^2\le\|\widehat{C}\widehat{\delta}\|_2^2.$$

We further have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\widehat{h}-\widehat{C}\beta)^T\widehat{C}\widehat{\delta}=(\widehat{h}-h)^T\widehat{C}\widehat{\delta}-\beta^T(\widehat{C}-C)\widehat{C}\widehat{\delta}\\
&=(\widehat{h}-h)^TC\widehat{\delta}+(\widehat{h}-h)^T(\widehat{C}-C)\widehat{\delta}-\beta^T(\widehat{C}-C)C\widehat{\delta}-\beta^T(\widehat{C}-C)(\widehat{C}-C)\widehat{\delta}\\
&\le\|\widehat{h}-h\|_\infty\|C\|_\infty\|\delta\|_1+\|\widehat{h}-h\|_\infty\|\widehat{C}-C\|_\infty\|\delta\|_1\\
&\quad+\|\beta\|_\infty\|\widehat{C}-C\|_\infty\|C\|_\infty\|\widehat{\delta}\|_1+\|\beta\|_\infty\|\widehat{C}-C\|_{\max}^2\|\widehat{\delta}\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $C$ is a diagonal matrix in the last inequality. Consider the event $E_4=\{\|\widehat{C}-C\|_\infty\le\nu'\}$, where $\nu'=2(c')^2$. Under this event, and noting that $\|\beta\|_\infty\le 1$, inequality (18) reduces to

$$\frac{\nu^2}{4}\|\widehat{\delta}\|_2^2\le 2\nu'\Big[\|\widehat{h}-h\|_\infty+\|\widehat{C}-C\|_\infty\Big]\|\widehat{\delta}\|_1.$$

Since both $\widehat{\beta}$ and $\beta$ belong to the set $\mathcal{F}$, we have

$$0 = \|\beta\|_1 - \|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 \leq \|\beta_S\|_1 - \|\widehat{\beta}_S\|_1 - \|\widehat{\beta}_{S^c}\|_1 \leq \|\widehat{\delta}_S\|_1 - \|\widehat{\delta}_{S^c}\|_1,$$

where $S = \mathrm{supp}(\beta)$ and $S^c$ denotes its complement. Thus,

$$\|\widehat{\delta}\|_1 \leq 2\|\widehat{\delta}_S\|_1 \leq 2|S|^{1/2}\|\widehat{\delta}_S\|_2 \leq 2|S|^{1/2}\|\widehat{\delta}\|_2.$$

We obtain that

$$\|\widehat{\delta}\|_2 \leq \frac{8\nu'|S|^{1/2}}{\nu^2}\Big[\|\widehat{h} - h\|_\infty + \|\widehat{C} - C\|_\infty\Big].$$

Recall that $\beta = A_{j\cdot}^T$ for any $j \in J$. Similar to the proof of (b), pooling over $j$ together, we have

$$\max_{j\in J}\|\widehat{A}_{j\cdot} - A_{j\cdot}\|_2 \leq \frac{8\nu'|S|^{1/2}}{\nu^2}\Big[\|\widehat{H} - H\|_\infty + \|\widehat{C} - C\|_\infty\Big] \lesssim \sqrt{s\log p/n},$$

where $s = \max_{j\in J}|\mathrm{supp}(A_{j\cdot})|$ is the maximum row sparsity of $A_J$. Similarly,

$$\max_{j\in J}\|\widehat{A}_{j\cdot} - A_{j\cdot}\|_1 \leq \frac{16\nu'|S|}{\nu^2}\Big[\|\widehat{H} - H\|_\infty + \|\widehat{C} - C\|_\infty\Big] \lesssim s\sqrt{\log p/n}.$$

This completes the proof of (d). □

### Proof of Proposition 8

Recall that by Proposition 5 (c), there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $\|\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T - AA^T\|_\infty < c'''/2\sqrt{\log p/n}$ with probability at least $1 - c_1 p^{-c_2}$. For any $j \in \widehat{V}_k$, there exists some $s \in \widehat{I}_k$ such that $(\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T)_{js} > \mu$. To show $\widehat{V}_k \subseteq V_k$, let $\mu = c'''/2\sqrt{\log p/n}$, then

$$(AA^T)_{js} \geq (\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T)_{js} - \|\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T - AA^T\|_\infty \geq \mu - \|\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T - AA^T\|_\infty > 0.$$

Thus, we get $j \in V_k$ which leads to $\widehat{V}_k \subseteq V_k$. On the other hand, if $j \in V_k$, then

$$(\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T)_{js} \geq (AA^T)_{js} - \|\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T - AA^T\|_\infty \geq c'''\sqrt{\log p/n} - \|\widehat{A}\widehat{A}^T - AA^T\|_\infty > \mu.$$

Thus, $j \in \widehat{V}_k$ which leads to $V_k \subseteq \widehat{V}_k$. The result follows. □

## References


Abbe, E. and Sandon, C. (2015). Community detection in general stochastic block models: Fundamental limits and efficient algorithms for recovery. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on*. IEEE.

Airoldi, E. M., Blei, D. M., Fienberg, S. E. and Xing, E. P. (2008). Mixed membership stochastic blockmodels. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **9** 1981–2014.

Arthur, D. and Vassilvitskii, S. (2007). k-means++: The advantages of careful seeding. In *Proceedings of the eighteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

Ashburner, M., Ball, C. A., Blake, J. A., Botstein, D., Butler, H., Cherry, J. M., Davis, A. P., Dolinski, K., Dwight, S. S. and Eppig, J. T. (2000). Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. *Nature genetics* **25** 25–29.

Best, M. G., Sol, N., Kooi, I., Tannous, J., Westerman, B. A., Rustenburg, F., Schellen, P., Verschueren, H., Post, E., Koster, J. et al. (2015). Rna-seq of tumor-educated platelets enables blood-based pan-cancer, multiclass, and molecular pathway cancer diagnostics. *Cancer cell* **28** 666–676.

Bezdek, J. C. (2013). *Pattern recognition with fuzzy objective function algorithms*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Bien, J., Bunea, F. and Xiao, L. (2016). Convex banding of the covariance matrix. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **111** 834–845.

Bunea, F., Giraud, C. and Luo, X. (2016a). Minimax optimal variable clustering in g-models via cord. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.01939* .

Bunea, F., Giraud, C., Royer, M. and Verzelen, N. (2016b). Pecok: a convex optimization approach to variable clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05100* .

Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D. and Kato, K. (2013). Gaussian approximations and multiplier bootstrap for maxima of sums of high-dimensional random vectors. *The Annals of Statistics* **41** 2786–2819.

Craddock, R. C., James, G. A., Holtzheimer, P. E., Hu, X. P. and Mayberg, H. S. (2012). A whole brain fmri atlas generated via spatially constrained spectral clustering. *Human brain mapping* **33** 1914–1928.

Craddock, R. C., Jbabdi, S., Yan, C.-G., Vogelstein, J. T., Castellanos, F. X., Di Martino, A., Kelly, C., Heberlein, K., Colcombe, S. and Milham, M. P. (2013). Imaging human connectomes at the macroscale. *Nature methods* **10** 524–539.

Guédon, O. and Vershynin, R. (2016). Community detection in sparse networks via grothendieck's inequality. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **165** 1025–1049.

Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American statistical association* **58** 13–30.

Izenman, A. J. (2008). Modern multivariate statistical techniques: regression, classification, and manifold learning. *Springer texts in statistics* .

Jiang, D., Tang, C. and Zhang, A. (2004). Cluster analysis for gene expression data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering* **16** 1370–1386.

Krishnapuram, R., Joshi, A., Nasraoui, O. and Yi, L. (2001). Low-complexity fuzzy relational clustering algorithms for web mining. *IEEE transactions on Fuzzy Systems* **9** 595–607.

Kumar, A., Sabharwal, Y. and Sen, S. (2004). A simple linear time (1+/spl epsiv/)-approximation algorithm for k-means clustering in any dimensions. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2004. Proceedings. 45th Annual IEEE Symposium on*. IEEE.

Le, C. M., Levina, E. and Vershynin, R. (2016). Optimization via low-rank approximation for community detection in networks. *The Annals of Statistics* **44** 373–400.

Lei, J. and Rinaldo, A. (2015). Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics* **43** 215–237.

Lei, J. and Zhu, L. (2014). A generic sample splitting approach for refined community recovery in stochastic block models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.1469* .

Lloyd, S. (1982). Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE transactions on information theory* **28** 129–137.

Peng, J. and Wei, Y. (2007). Approximating k-means-type clustering via semidefinite programming. *SIAM journal on optimization* **18** 186–205.

Von Luxburg, U. (2007). A tutorial on spectral clustering. *Statistics and computing* **17** 395–416.

Wiwie, C., Baumbach, J. and Röttger, R. (2015). Comparing the performance of biomedical clustering methods. *Nature methods* **12** 1033–1038.

Zhang, Y., Levina, E. and Zhu, J. (2014). Detecting overlapping communities in networks using spectral methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3432* .